REMARKS

In light of the above amendments and remarks to follow, reconsideration and allowance of this application are respectfully requested.

Previously pending claims 1-23 were rejected over Melen, U.S. Patent No. 6,426,806, or some combination of Melen and another reference. It is respectfully submitted that the claims, as presented herein, are patentably distinct from Melen.

The system of Melen routes scanned documents to a specific location based on a scanned control sheet. In Melen, if a user wishes to send a document to a location, he/she scans the document and an associated control sheet. The system then extracts an identifier from the control sheet. The identifier represents a location to send the scanned document. The extracted identifier is matched to other identifiers in a database. If there is a match, then the document is sent to the location associated with the identifier. If there is no match, then the system routes the document to a "lost" location. Col. 3, line 60 to col. 4, line 3 of Melen recites in part as follows:

> "After the document identifier 126 has been set in any of steps 220, 222, or 224, the document 104 is scanned 226 into scanner 106, resulting in scanned document information 110.... CPU 114 then transfers 228 scanned document information 110 to the location 120 associated with document identifier 126."

Melen does not disclose transferring the identifier, nor the control sheet from which the identifier is extracted from, to a location. In other words, Melen does not transfer the scanned information based on data extracted from the scanned information. Rather, it transmits different information, such as the document attached to the control sheet.

Indeed, it appears from the Melen that the control sheet and attached document have are unusable if either one is missing.

The pending claims are different from Melen in many respects. First, the invention expressed by claims 1 and 3 routes the extracted data based on the extracted data whereas Melen routes the scanned document based on information extracted from a different document (such as control sheet).

Second, the extracted data includes a type of document and the content of the document (see claim 1 and 3) whereas the extracted data in Melen represents a location to send the document. For example, the type of document may include, but is not limited to, a purchase order or mortgage application. (See paragraph [0047] of the present application.) In this example, if the type of document is a mortgage application, the content of the document may include field names and their associated values. For example, the field may be a person's first name and the associated value may be John. (See paragraph [0039] of the present application.) Melen makes no mention of using both type and content in its routing.

Third, the invention expressed by claims 2 and 3 compares the extracted data to predetermined business rules to see if the extracted data complies with the rules. Comparing the extracted data to a customer's business rules is advantageous. For example, in one aspect, it may take into account the business rules applicable to the standards or practices of a business or industry to perform compliance checking and to tailor the document capture and management specifically to the customer's business. Thus, if a customer is in the insurance industry and a claim is being filed, the system of the present invention would check to see if the First Name and Last Name fields contain non-null values. If the customer is in the banking industry and a person is filing a loan application, the system would check to see if the Loan Amount

field had an associated value less than 300,000 unless the Jumbo Loan field had an associated value "yes". (See paragraph [0040] of the present application.)Melen, on the other hand, merely checks the identifier to determine a location to send the scanned documents. Melen does not disclose checking the extracted data if it complies with predetermined business rules.

Fifth, in the invention expressed in claim 30, the extracted data may be converted into different file formats depending on the type of program that will use the extracted data. There is no disclosure in Melen that the extracted data may be converted into different file formats.

Sixth, and unlike claim 15, there is no disclosure in Melen regarding the determination of information relating to processing of a document at one or more events nor is there a means of reporting t

he status information. For example, in the system of the present invention, "[m]ultiple event logfile entries are generated for each document as it passes through the various subsystems. These event logfile entries, stored in an event database, can be useful in a number of respects. For example, they can be used in status checking, in queries, or in generating billing files.... Reporting tools are provided to enable customers to receive detailed transaction status information on a periodic (e.g., hourly, daily, weekly, monthly, etc.) basis." (See paragraph [0053] of the present application.)

Accordingly, independent claims 1-3 and 15, as well as independent claims 20-23 which are somewhat similar to claims 1-3 and 15 respectively, are distinguishable from Melen. Furthermore, claims 4-14, and 16-19 depend from one of the independent claims, and at least due to such dependency, are distinguishable from Melen as well as any combination of references that include Melen.

For the reasons described above, new claims 24-33 are believed to be distinguishable from the applied prior art.

As it is believed that all of the rejections set forth in the Official Action have been fully met, favorable reconsideration and allowance are earnestly solicited. If, however, for any reason the Examiner does not believe that such action can be taken at this time, it is respectfully requested that he/she telephone applicant's attorney at (908) 654-5000 in order to overcome any additional objections which he might have.

If there are any additional charges in connection with this requested amendment, the Examiner is authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 12-1095 therefor.

Dated: October 26, 2005   Respectfully submitted,

By _____
Mayush Singhvi
Registration No.: 50,431
LERNER, DAVID, LITTENBERG,
   KRUMHOLZ & MENTLIK, LLP
600 South Avenue West
Westfield, New Jersey   07090
(908) 654-5000
Attorney for Applicant

605233_1.DOC